

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended and claims 6-9 are added. Support for the amendments to independent claim 1 may be found at least at paragraphs [0040]-[0044] of the specification and Figs. 5-9. Support for the subject matter of new claims 6-8 may be found at least at paragraphs [0040]-[0044] of the specification and Figs. 5-9. Support for new claim 9 may be found at least at paragraph [0039] and Fig. 4 of the specification. No new matter is added. Reconsideration based on the amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Personal Interview

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiners Shearer and Shaver in the September 9 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over JP 2002-159893 (Tetsuo). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that, as discussed during the personal interview, Tetsuo fails to teach and would not have rendered obvious "at least one rib being formed inside the jet ring to fix the mesh," as recited in independent claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that Tetsuo teaches no ribbing features which may hold a mesh in place inside of a jet ring. Furthermore, the Tetsuo reference would not have had any requirement for having a plurality of rib elements because the mesh of Tetsuo appears to be placed in a fixed location. One of ordinary skill in the art would not have motivation to combine the teachings of Tetsuo with any other reference to render obvious the presently claimed features because of the fixed nature of the mesh in the Tetsuo reference. Thus,

Tetsuo fails to teach and would not have rendered obvious each and every feature of independent claim 1.

Claims 2-5 depend from independent claim 1. Because the applied reference fails to teach or render obvious each and every feature cited in independent claim 1, dependent claims 2-5 are patentable at least for the reasons that independent claim 1 is patentable as well as for the additional features they recite.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

New Claims

Claims 6-9 depend from independent claim 1. Because the applied reference fails to teach or render obvious each and every feature of independent claim 1, dependent claims 6-9 are patentable for at least the reasons claim 1 is patentable, as well as for the additional features they recite.

Accordingly, allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Smith Sirisakorn
Registration No. 65,056

JAO:SZS/amt

Attachments:

Request for Continued Examination
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: September 15, 2009

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--